

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 24-46 remain pending in this application and are submitted for reconsideration by the Examiner.

Claims 24-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0162562 to Curtiss et al. (hereinafter “Curtiss”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,633,963 to Anderson et al. (hereinafter “Anderson”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

In accordance with embodiments of the present invention, mobile terminals may support accessories with one or more functions, and each of the functions may correspond to one or more modes. As noted by the example in the specification, an accessory may be a hands-free headset, and one of the functions of the accessory may be the audio output, which may have different modes corresponding to stereo output or mono output.

The mobile terminal may read a capability array from the accessory and identify a mode of a function of the accessory from the content of a field of the capability array. The mobile terminal may then support the function in the identified mode (e.g., stereo for the audio output).

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner cites the combination of Curtiss and Anderson as allegedly teaching each feature of the pending claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion that Curtiss discloses a “mobile terminal capable of supporting each accessory function in two or more modes.” The Examiner cites Curtiss as disclosing this feature at paragraphs [0032] and [0037] and, in particular, points to the disclosure in Curtiss that “the type of accessory include a speaker phone system, a hands free ear piece, adapter battery or an interface module for interfacing with other electronic devices.” Office Action dated June 9, 2010, page 2. Applicant respectfully notes that the cited portion of Curtiss merely discloses various types of

accessories. There is no teaching or suggestion in the cited portion, or any other portion, of Curtiss that such accessories have two or more modes, let alone that the mobile terminal may identify a mode and support the accessory function in that mode.

Second, the Examiner's reliance on Anderson falls short of rendering the claims obvious. Anderson discloses a headset adapter which can control and monitor operations for the headset accessory. Applicant is unable to find any disclosure in the cited portions of Anderson of the features of the pending claims. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion in Anderson of "identifying a mode of an accessory function in dependence on the content of a field of the capability array," as recited in the pending claims.

The Examiner cites Anderson as allegedly disclosing this feature at Anderson col. 3, lines 5-15 and col. 23 through col. 24, lines 1-65. Specifically, the Examiner appears to quote Anderson as disclosing "where to provide a table with included the content of a field containing the bits value based on the application of the accessory function such as interface or bus; and adapter interface, for example, accessory interface bus for telephone headset adapter." Office Action dated June 9, 2010, page 3. After a thorough review of the entire disclosure of Anderson, Applicant is unable to find the quoted passage. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specify the location of the quoted language.

Thus, the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of the pending claims. Since Curtiss and Anderson, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each feature of the pending claims, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Therefore, pending independent claims 24, 34, 35 and 46 are patentable. Further, claims 25-33 and 36-45 each depend from one of allowable claims 24 or 35 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-5302. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-5302. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-5302.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 9, 2010

By /Sanjeev K. Dhand/

ALBERTDHAND LLP  
Customer Number: 98359  
Telephone: (858) 764-2453  
Facsimile: (858) 430-4886

Sanjeev K. Dhand  
Registration No. 51,182  
Attorney for Applicant